

Serial No. 10/611,460; Filed 6/30/03  
Statement of Substance of Interview

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Tzong-Fen Fuh, et al ) Confirmation No.: 1623  
  )  
Serial No.: 10/611,460                          ) Examiner: Whipple, Brian P.  
  )  
Filing Date: June 30, 2003                      ) Art Unit: 2152  
For: Local Authentication of a Client at a Network Device

**Mail Stop AF**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**

Sir:

An Examiner Interview, attended by Rhys Cheung and Christopher Palermo for the Applicants, and Examiners Brian Whipple and Dohm Chankong, was held on September 11, 2008, in which U.S. Patent No. 6,317,838, issued to *Baize*, et al. (“*Baize*”), “Reflexive Access Lists,” published 5/5/1999, by Welcher, Peter J. (“*Welcher*”), U.S. Patent No. 5,689,638, issued to *Sadovsky*, et al. (“*Sadovsky*”), “Configuring IP Access Lists,” by Cisco Systems, Inc. (“*Cisco I*”), and “Release Notes for the Cisco 1000 Series Routers for Cisco IOS Release 11.3,” by Cisco Systems, Inc. (“*Cisco II*”) were discussed, along with the amendments that were made to Claim 1 of the present application in a response to Office action that was filed on September 9, 2008.

In particular, Applicants asked Examiner Whipple to reconsider the eligibility of *Welcher* and *Cisco I* as prior art references. Examiner Whipple indicated that he agreed with Applicants’ assessment, and has agreed to remove *Welcher* and *Cisco I* as references. Applicants also expressed that *Cisco II* cannot be used to qualify other references as prior art when those other references would not otherwise qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Furthermore, Applicants also discussed some substantive features of Claim 1 as they relate to the cited art. Specifically, Applicants discussed the “means for reconfiguring ...” feature of Claim 1, and explained reasons why the cited references fail to teach the complete feature. Applicants explained that *Baize* does not modify its access lists (the IP Filtering rules 20), and *Baize* does not keep an open passageway after a user terminates a session. Applicants also discussed how *Cisco I* does not use any authorization information, but rather adds entries to reflexive ACLs when a router implicitly authorizes a client by initiating communication with the client (i.e. “in response to sessions that originate inside the router.”).

Lastly, based on Applicants’ explanations of the features of Claim 1, Examiner Whipple indicated it is possible that prior art reference *Sadovsky* does not fill the gaps left behind by *Baize* and *Cisco I*.

Based on the points discussed, Examiner Whipple indicated that he will conduct a new search for further examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: September 11, 2008

/RhysWCheung#58648/

Rhys W. Cheung  
Reg. No. 58,648

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 754-1450  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076